UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

| NORTHERN DIVISION | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| CHARLES JUDSON HOL | BROOK, Petitioner, | Case No. 2:15-cv-131 HON. R. ALLAN EDGAR | |
| CATHERINE BAUMAN, | | | |
| | Respondent. | | |
| | | / | |
| ORDER A | DOPTING REF | PORT AND RECOMMENDATION | |
| The Court has before | re it Petitioner's | Objection to Magistrate Judge Timothy P. Greeley's | |
| Report and Recommendation | on ("R&R") that | the petition for writ of habeas corpus be dismissed | |
| because it is barred by the | one-year statute o | of limitations. ECF No. 13. Petitioner does not argue | |
| that he filed his petition tim | nely, that he is en | ntitled to equitable tolling, or allege any facts or | |
| circumstances that would s | how actual innoc | cence. ¹ Petitioner merely states that he is entitled to | |
| the miscarriage-of-justice e | exception because | e he is actually innocent. McQuiggin v. Perkins, 133 | |
| S.Ct. 1924, 1931–32 (2013 |); Schlup v. Delo | , 513 U.S. 298 (1995). | |
| However, as Judge | Greeley notes in | his R&R, Petitioner has not established that he is | |
| actually innocent, or provide | led new evidence | e of his innocence. Instead, Petitioner filed various | |
| letters, objections, affidavit | ts, and supplemen | nts that in no way suggest that he is actually innocent. | |

Accordingly, Magistrate Judge Greeley's R&R is APPROVED AND ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court. ECF No. 13. The petition is **DISMISSED** as barred by the one-year statute of limitations. ECF No. 1. Petitioner's motion to produce, ECF No. 33, and motion to appoint counsel, ECF No. 37, are denied as moot. IT IS ORDERED that a certificate of

appealability is denied. A judgment consistent with this Order will be entered.

SO ORDERED.

| Dated:1/6/2016 | 1/6/2016 | /s/R. Allan Edgar |
|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------|
| | R. Allan Edgar | |
| | | United States District Court Judge |

¹ Petitioner does ask the Court to consider his current petition timely based on a previously filed habeas petition that was dismissed without prejudice for failure to pay the filing fee, 1:13-cy-663. The previously dismissed petition does not entitle Petitioner to tolling, nor does his other habeas petitions dismissed without prejudice for failure to pay the failing fee or for lack of prosecution. See 1:14-cv-890; 2:15-cv-56.